Assessment Rubric

Name(s): Ong YiLiang   Programme: RMM3S1   Group: G2   Date: 7/9/2021

Program Development and Final Report (75%) – CLO3

No	Item	Criteria			Final Marks
		Poor	**Accomplished**	**Good**	
1	Problem statement (10)	No or very little discussion on existing problem and the project The proposed project already exists, or with very minor change. No discussion or very little of introduction given to the related system or technology. 0-4	Little discussion on existing problem and introduction of proposed project. Minor ideas are modified from existing system(s). Introduction to the related system is given, but no evaluation provided. 5-7	Good discussion and evaluation of existing problem and the proposed project. Ideas modified from existing system, with some creative ideas are added. Good discussion and evaluation of the related system. 8-10	
2	Programming (20)	The end product fails with many logic errors, many actions lacked exception handling. Solutions are over-simplified. Programming skill needs improvement. Minimal validations are provided. Business rules are not validated. 0-8	Major parts are logical, but some steps to complete a specific job may be tedious or unnecessarily complicated. Program algorithm demonstrates acceptable level of complexity. The student is qualified to be a programmer Important and necessary validations are provided. 9-15	Correct and logical flow, exceptions are handled well. Demonstrates appropriate or high level of complex algorithms and programming skills. Thorough and thoughtful validations are provided. All important business rules are validated. 16-20	
3	degree of completion (10)	Too much still remain to be done. Basic requirements are not fulfilled. The end product produces enormous errors, faults or incorrect results. 0-4	All required features present in the interface within the required scope, but some are simplified. Or one or two features are missing. The system is able to run with minor errors. 5-7	All required features present in the interface within or beyond the required scope. No bugs apparent during demonstration. 8-10	
4	system implementation (10)	The end product is produced with different system design or approach, which is not related to the initial proposal. 0-4	The end product conforms to most of the system design, but some are different from the specification. 5-7	The end product fully conforms to the proposed system design. 8-10	
5	Results (Performance measurement) (10)	Analytical methods were missing or inappropriately aligned with data and research design. Results were confusing. 0-4	The analytical methods were identified. Results were presented. All were related to the research question and design. Sufficient metric or measurement is applied. 5-7	Analytical methods and results presentation were sufficient, specific, clear, structured and appropriate based on the research questions and research design. Extra metric or measurement is applied. 8-10	

No	Item	Criteria			Final Marks
		Poor	**Accomplished**	**Good**	
6	Discussion and Conclusion (10)	Little discussions were presented. Answers to the research question and system performance were unclear or confusing. 3-4	Discussions of the results were presented. The research question and system performance were answered and identified. 5-7	The significance of the results of the work was discussed, sufficiently inclusive of the information that concluded and answered the research question and system performance is evaluated comprehensively. Limitations and future improvements of the studies were identified. 8-10	
7	Organization (5)	The structure of the paper was weak. Transition was weak and difficult to understand. 0-2	A workable structure was presented for presenting ideas. Transition was smooth and clear. 3-4	Structure was intuitive and sufficiently inclusive of important information of the research. Transition from one to another was smooth and organized. 5	
				Sum of Score	

Presentation (25%) – CLO2

No	Item	Criteria			Final Marks
		Poor	Accomplished	Good	
1	Output (10)	Inadequate information/outputs needed are generated. Most of the information/outputs generated are less accurate. Results visualization is overly cluttered or the design seems inappropriate for problem area. Lack of information that are useful for the user 0-4	Adequate information/outputs needed are generated. The information/output generated are accurate but some with errors. Pleasant looking, clean, well-organized results visualization The information displayed are useful for the user, but some details are omitted. 5-7	All the necessary information/outputs are generated. All or most of the information/outputs generated are accurate. Minor errors can be ignored. The results are visually pleasing and appealing. Great use of colors, fonts, graphics and layout. The information displayed are useful to the users and complete with necessary details. 8-10	
2	Presentation (10)	Presentation was unclear. Results were presented without justifications and reasons. Results were not supported with ML concepts and theories. 0-4	Presentation is well organized for the most part, but more clarity with transitions is needed. Answers to the research question and system performances were supported with sufficient ML concepts and theories. 5-7	Presentation was concise and straight to the points. Discussions of the results were presented and illustrated in easily interpretable graphs or charts. The research question and system performance were answered and identified. 8-10	
3	Question and answer (5)	The student is unclear about the work produced, sometimes not even knowing where to find the source code. 0-1	The student knows the code whereabouts, but sometimes may not be clear why the work was done in such a way. 2-3	The student is clear about every piece of the work done. 4-5	
				Sum of Score	